



WHAT NEXT?

—OR,—

SHALL WE HAVE A MISSIONARY BISHOPRIC?

LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, CANADA.

It is now about a year since I published my "Letter," entitled "Missionary Bishops; a Plea for Indians and Immigrants, particularly in the Algoma District." The object of that "Letter" was to arouse attention to the religious necessities of a large and rapidly growing population, in a new section of the Dominion; and to propose some zealous and united course of action by which the wants of the people may be supplied, and the growth of the Church be made contemporaneous with the growth of the country.

There is some reason to hope that the "Letter" may yet prove as "bread cast upon the waters." It evidently touched a responsive chord throughout the Church. At our different Synods, held shortly after the issue of the "Letter," the subject of a Missionary Bishop for Algoma was introduced. In each case a resolution was passed, approving of the project, and appointing a Committee to confer with other committees in making preliminary enquiries and arrangements. Without any formal meeting of these Committees, the subject was thrown by the House of Bishops on a special meeting of the Provincial Synod; and without either any clearly defined plan of action, or any guaranteed fund for its support, the Algoma District was constituted by that Synod a Missionary Diocese, for which a Bishop was eventually, with some difficulty, elected. No effort has since been made to raise an endowment for the Bishopric; with singular inconsistency, the Provincial Synod left undetermined the bounds of the diocese, the amount of income for the Bishop, the mode of its payment, and a dozen other questions which were intimately connected with the practical organization of the scheme; after long deliberation, the clergyman elected to the office of Bishop, has seen fit to decline the responsibility and honor; and here we are to-day, not only without a Missionary Diocese, without a Missionary Bishop, and without even the shadow of a fund for the support of such a movement, but practically farther off from the object sought than we were before the special meeting of the Provincial Synod, with less sympathy and interest, and with more division and alienation among the members of the Church in general.

Such a fact is certainly not very creditable to us. It makes one blush to think of all the apathy, and discord, and vacillation, and complications, which have characterized this very simple proposal. That a movement so obviously necessary, so imperatively called for, so auspiciously begun, and so eminently calculated to evoke generous enthusiasm, should so signally fail in even its preliminary stages, is suggestive of either very bad management, or very deficient zeal. There can be no question that a gross blunder has been made somewhere; ere can be no doubt that better arrangements must be made in the

future, if we are to succeed; and it is to ascertain the causes of this lamentable failure, and to suggest some practicable plan of action in our present emergency, that I again apply myself to the subject. In doing this I bespeak from all a candid attention—a generous forbearance. I have no other object in view than the efficiency of the Church, and the moral improvement of the country. If I can prevent such a calamity, I am resolved that this project for a Missionary Bishopric shall not be strangled in its birth—shall not be ignominiously buried and forgotten. There is doubtless a danger of this. All the prudence and energy we can command may be required to meet the difficulty. At the risk of imputation from the censorious and suspicious, I will honestly contribute my mite towards a satisfactory adjustment of apparent complications. I believe the great body of the Church will heartily sympathise with the views I intend to enunciate; and will as readily respond to an appeal for help, if the Synod will only propose a thoroughly practicable scheme, and prove itself in earnest in trying to carry it out.

It is necessary to review briefly the history of this movement. The whole of the present complications arise from a disregard of the action taken by our Diocesan Synods in 1872, and from the premature, not to say, unconstitutional, action of the Provisional Synod in December last. As I have previously shown, the subject of a Missionary Bishopric has at intervals engaged the attention of the Church for years past. Whether or not the result of my "Letter" on "Missionary Bishops," it is immaterial to inquire; but at each of our Diocesan Synods held last summer, and also at the Clerical meeting of the Quebec diocese, which for that year took the place of the Synod, the subject was introduced and discussed, and in accordance with the views expressed, a resolution was unanimously—yea, enthusiastically passed. In each case the resolution declared the necessity of a Missionary Bishopric for Algoma, and appointed a Committee to confer with similar Committees appointed by the other dioceses. These several Committees, or representatives from them, were intended to form one General Committee, by which all the preliminary inquiry should be made, and all the necessary information should be collected; and by which a well prepared, and carefully digested scheme should be arranged, both for raising an endowment, and for carrying on the future work of the Mission. The report and recommendations of this Committee,—as presented first at the Diocesan Synods,—were to form the basis of action on the part of the Provincial Synod, when it should be convened by the Metropolitan. In the Canon proposed by the House of Bishops, an express stipulation was inserted, that "adequate provision" should be made before the appointment of a Missionary Bishop took place. This obviously required some systematic effort towards the raising of an endowment; and when it was understood that a grant of £950 sterling had been made by the Propagation Society on condition that within three years the Canadian Church should raise £4000, the assumption was, that the first effort would and should be in this direction.

Such a course seemed very direct and simple. It would have prevented hasty legislation; it would have secured a liberal endowment; it would have organized the diocese in a strictly constitutional form; it would have united all the members of the Church in support of so great an undertaking; and these surely were advantages too important to be lightly overlooked. By the adoption of a different plan, the

gravest inconveniences have arisen. The instructions of the Diocesan Synods were disregarded; the functions of the Committees appointed by those Synods were ignored; the proposal to raise an endowment was thwarted, and thereby the grant from the Propagation Society endangered; and, in short, the whole thing has been so complicated, and so mismanaged, as to injure an enterprise which promised the happiest results, and to bring discredit upon the whole Church by which it had been begun.

I believe we all deeply mourn over this result. There is not one amongst us who did not desire the success of the Algoma Mission, and who was not prepared both to give and labor to ensure this success; and however much some may have regretted the precipitate action of the Provincial Synod, all were anxious that an arrangement arrived at with so much difficulty should be honored and sustained. It is now useless to complain; it would be criminal to censure and reproach. What has been done was done with the best motive. If we have gone wrong, it has been with a desire to do right; and allowing that our efforts have so far been unsuccessful, and that an unexpected difficulty now stares us in the face, still our duty is, as men of business, and men of faith, to make the best of untoward circumstances, and to endeavor by united counsel and courageous action, to surmount the danger, and to place the enterprise henceforward upon a sure and satisfactory basis. The bishops of the Church are no more responsible for doing this than the humblest of their clergy, and the poorest of the laity. We have a common interest in the matter. It appeals to the sympathy and devotion of all; and if we are sincere and earnest in our wishes, we shall not be long in devising means to extricate the Church from its present unenviable position, and to made the Algoma Mission a certain and glorious success.

As the first necessary step, it appears to me, there should be, without any delay, a meeting of the combined Committees to which reference has been made. In such meeting the whole question can be amicably and candidly discussed; and by such discussion a practicable plan for future action may be evolved. There is no justifiable reason for ignoring those Committees. They were appointed by their respective Synods to perform a prescribed work. The Synods will naturally expect from them a report of their proceedings. Is it to be then said that their existence was never recognized, that their co-operation was never requested, that their opinion even was never asked? Such a presentation would not be very complimentary to the Synods, and assuredly not very flattering to the members of the Committees themselves. And there is danger of such an undesirable report. The Committees are without doubt accountable to their Synods. If they are not convened together, the authority of the Synods is simply set at nought; and for such an outrage some reason must be assigned. It is surely not desirable to provoke any collision on a point of authority and order like this; and whether the Committees can do anything effectual or not, it will certainly be better that they should have an opportunity of carrying out the instructions they received. Had the arrangement of the Provincial Synod remained good, I hoped that the co-operation of the General Committee would have proved serviceable to the bishop and his diocese; but now that that arrangement has fallen through, I maintain that the action of the Committee is more necessary than ever. We have in reality to begin the whole subject afresh. There is nothing

actually done. There is no bishop, no diocese, no fund, no scheme or regulation of any kind which will meet the emergency; and if this is not the opportunity for the members of the Committees to confer together—according to the resolutions of the Synods—then I cannot conceive when the occasion may arise, and it is impossible to divine for what reason the Committee was appointed at all. Would there be no advantage in a free interchange of opinion between the bishops, and the clerical and lay members of the Committee? and is it not, at least, desirable to have some understanding about the manner in which the funds for the proposed diocese are to be raised, and about the probable expenditure which may or should be incurred? Are we really to begin to build without first counting the cost? and are we to commit the egregious blunder of asking any number of men to give up settled parishes and comfortable homes, and to endure toil, and sacrifice, and pain, without even an approach to a provision for their ordinary wants? Yet if “an adequate provision” is to be made, who is to make it? and how is it to be made? Is it to be by voluntary contributions? then where is the organization for collecting? Or is it to be by assessment on the Synods? then who shall determine the proportion for each? These questions are not wholly irrelevant. They must be discussed some time; they must be decided by some power; and will it not save the time of the Synods, and facilitate the adjustment of all difficulty, if the properly authorized Committee should meet at once, and after mature inquiry and deliberation, prepare some scheme which it may recommend for adoption by the Diocesan and Provincial Synods?

And what course may it be advisable to adopt, in the interests of the Church, should the Committee be convened, or should the matter be deferred until the meetings of the Synods? Shall we suspend the enterprise, in deference to some new and higher claim? or shall it be prosecuted, under new conditions, and with greater vigor? There are three courses open before us, upon one of which we must decide. We may either abandon the idea of a Missionary Bishopric in Algoma, and leave the district, as at present, within the jurisdiction of the Toronto diocese; or the district may be left as a Missionary diocese, already constituted, in the hands of the Provincial Synod, subject to the election of a Bishop when that Synod shall meet, according to the terms of the Canon provided in such cases; or the Synod of the Toronto diocese may claim to exercise control over the district, as it has never yet formally surrendered that control; and in view of the complications which have taken place, make a separate and independent arrangement for the appointment of a Suffragan or Missionary Bishop for Algoma and Muskoka, and other contiguous places, according to its own Canons and By-Laws.

These alternatives open up the question in every possible light; and upon each aspect, as thus presented, I must presume to say a few words—primarily with the idea of preparing for immediate or future discussion.

The *first* proposal implies an abandonment of the scheme. It has been suggested that after all the Algoma District is not the promising field for the Church we have represented it to be. The population is limited; the land is not fertile; the number of Church members is small; the facilities for travel, and the means of communication, are unsatisfactory; and, finally, there is no prospect of any rapid development and growth in the resources of the country, or in the extent of its

population. It would be better, therefore, to leave untouched the relation of Algoma to the Toronto diocese, and in place of a Missionary Bishopric for that district only, to make a division of the whole diocese, according to the plan elaborated by Dr. Lett, leaving Algoma to form an essential part of the Northern Division or Diocese.

This proposal has been gravely made since the present complication has arisen, by more than one member of the Church, whose zeal for missions, and whose anxiety, especially, for the evangelization of the Indian tribes, no one would ever call in question. The suggestion, therefore, is not to be summarily dismissed; and yet it can never be seriously entertained. Were it adopted, it would imply the severest condemnation and censure upon all our proceedings during the last year, and upon much that has been said and done on many former occasions. We should stand convicted by our own act of vacillation of purpose, of precipitancy in legislation, and of a positive misrepresentation of facts; and this surely is a condition to which none of us would willingly be reduced. It is too much to ask that we should thus stultify ourselves before the public, that we should thus throw discredit upon the Church, and that we should thus sacrifice our claim to confidence and respect.

Is there a proper reason for this suggestion? Are the facts of the case as they are here represented? Most certainly not. In years long since past, it was held by the Bishop, and by the Synod of the Toronto Diocese,—as well as by competent and disinterested observers not connected with the Synod at all,—that there was a *prima facie* ground—that there was an imperative need for missionary exertion throughout the whole of the Algoma District. As I have previously shown, the late Bishop of Toronto was intensely anxious for the establishment of a Missionary Bishopric at Sault Ste. Marie. In a Pastoral letter, dated January 16th, 1854, his Lordship makes special reference to the subject, and thus discusses the question of ways and means for the support of the Bishopric:

"In regard to the Bishopric of St. Mary, though not placed with the other three Sees, it is not to be forgotten, and may be endowed as follows: First, we have the donations or contributions within its bounds, which, though of very small amount, will nevertheless yield something, and will increase. Second, we have the hope of some excess over the fifty thousand pounds, a portion of which, and such a small percentage on the whole amount, as the Synod may seem fit to deduct, may both be added to what is collected in the Diocese. We have reason to look for special gifts to the See of St. Mary from the great Church Societies and other liberal and pious friends in England, because it is different from the other Sees in this: that it includes the heathen or Indians, for whose benefit it is more particularly intended. Should the sums to be derived from these three sources be insufficient, let them be carefully vested and allowed to accumulate till, from accruing interest and occasional offerings, the endowment shall be secured. In the meantime the See may be placed in charge of the Bishops of Toronto and London, as more adjacent, to visit alternately. In this way the four Bishoprics would be placed on a permanent basis, and the Church of Western Canada would not only find friends on all sides ready to assist and encourage her exertions; but she would become a spectacle of deep interest and example to the Christian world."

This is language sufficiently expressive of the wish of the Bishop, and of the practicability of his scheme. At a later period, he renewed his appeal in a manner which proved no diminution of interest or zeal on his part, although the desire so fondly cherished remained ungratified. When addressing the Synod in 1862, his Lordship again spoke, if anything more emphatically than in his Pastoral of 1854:

"The Synod is aware that when in London in 1850 he had called the attention of the proper authorities to the vast extent of the Diocese of Toronto, and suggested a plan for its division into four separate dioceses. After many delays and much trouble during more than ten years, he had the satisfaction to behold three of these dioceses (Huron, Toronto and Ontario) fully established; but the fourth See, or the proposed Bishopric of Ste. Marie, was still in abeyance, and yet . . . he still trusted and believed that it would become the seat of a Bishop of the Church of England, although he might not live to see its accomplishment. He ought, indeed, to be more than satisfied in having been in some degree instrumental, through God's benignant Providence, in establishing three out of the four dioceses proposed in 1850—but he still retained a yearning desire to do something for Ste. Marie before his departure, and it was this which prompted him to touch upon the subject. It was very central, and would become in time a large city, and be required for the religious teachings and civilization of North Western Canada. The region, of which it was the centre, offered space almost inexhaustable for the most extensive agricultural settlements; and mining establishments without number, especially in copper and iron of the finest quality, might in time be profitably erected along the banks of Lakes Huron and Superior, and the adjacent islands."

Is it necessary to refer to the reports which have been presented, and to the resolutions which have passed, at different meetings of both the Provincial Synod and the Synod of the Toronto Diocese? Do they not all speak the same language? Do they not all proclaim the same need? Do they not all propose the same supply? And is it to be supposed that for more than twenty years the Church has been under a delusion? that the Bishop was mistaken? that the Synods were deceived? and that, after all, the Indian tribes, and the white settlers, of Algoma, were better off than their brethren in other places, and had no claim for special exertion on their behalf? The thought is inadmissible. All the evidence we can collect justifies the action which was taken or proposed; and if twenty years ago the Bishop of Toronto thought it advisable to establish a Missionary Bishopric at Sault Ste. Marie, the necessity has not been reduced during that period, and the demand to-day is greater than it has ever been before.

The District of Algoma is now more settled, and more accurately understood, than it has heretofore been. We have the evidence of private narratives, and of official documents, to guide us in our judgment; and do they not all speak of a great, of a growing, and of a needy district? The first volume of the Census of 1871 is now before me; and imperfect as it may be in some particulars, it contains a mass of the most valuable information, for those who will give themselves the trouble to seek it. According to this, Algoma has not less than 27,605,802 acres of territory. A large portion of this is admirably suited for agricultural pursuits, whilst a still greater proportion abounds in mineral ore of different kinds. In 1861 the population of Algoma was 4,916; whereas in 1871 it had risen to 7,018. In reality the increase had been greater than was thus represented; and with the addition which has since been made, we may, at a very moderate estimate, put down the present population at near 10,000. The increase is still going on, perhaps more rapidly than during the ten years which elapsed between 1861 and 1871; and the prospect of an increase was certainly never more encouraging than now. According to the latest returns, published in the *Globe*, and other newspapers, the mines are becoming increasingly productive, and are likely to attract a larger number of laborers. The commencement of works in connection with the Canada Pacific Railway, must ere long give an impetus to emigration which will tell powerfully on the future of the district. At Prince Arthur's Landing, at Sault Ste. Marie, and at other convenient points,

there is a growing activity in building houses, and in carrying on trade; and whether or not my opinion be received as based upon a rational probability, or denounced as the dream of an enthusiast, I am still inclined to think, that despite all its drawbacks, Algoma is destined to become a populous, a flourishing, and a powerful district in the Dominion.

The statistics of religion, as furnished in the Census, are equally instructive. Out of the 7000 reported as the population, more than 3000 are put down as Roman Catholics, about 1020 as belonging to the Church of England, 533 Methodists 227 Presbyterians, and in addition to these several numbers, about 1100 as avowed Pagans. It is also to be remarked, that as the preponderance of professed Roman Catholics are resident in the Indian settlements of Manitoulin, and West Algoma, many of these persons are still to be regarded as involved in the ignorance and superstition which have always been characteristic of the Indian tribes. Is there not, then, among these people a field for religious activity—for missionary enterprise? Do not the members of our own Church require spiritual oversight and instruction? Are not the poor deluded heathen to be educated and civilized? Shall no provision be made for the spiritual necessities of the people who may yet crowd along the shores of the Georgian Bay, on the banks of Lake Superior, and on either side of the line of the Pacific Railway, as it cuts open the country from Sault Ste Marie to Fort Garry? And can this be done more effectually than by the appointment of a Missionary Bishop, with an adequate staff of missionaries, who may be supplied with the requisite means, and who will be devoted and zealous in their work?

It does appear to me, that this is our truest policy, that this is our imperative duty. The Roman Catholics are alive to the importance of a Bishop resident in their midst. The Methodists and Presbyterians are each striving for organization and progress throughout the district. And why may not we emulate their zeal? why may not we follow their example? why may not we seek by bold and united effort to realize the dream of years, and to make our Church eventually co-extensive with the district? Whatever reasons may have influenced the mind of Bishop Strachan in desiring the establishment of a Missionary Bishopric, or whatever motives may have prevailed with the Provincial Synod in December last in setting apart Algoma as a Missionary Diocese, I maintain exist now with double force; and it is simply impossible that we can suspend, much less abandon this enterprise, without unfaithfulness to the Church, and without a criminal indifference to the spiritual necessities of a vast district of our country.

When these reasons are combined, they will form a sufficient ground for rejecting the first alternative I have mentioned, and for pleading that the Algoma Bishopric may be speedily and successfully established.

With this assumption, the *second* point raised requires to be discussed. Shall we leave the project to the decision and control of the Provincial Synod, by whom another bishop may be elected, and by whom the proper arrangements should be made for funds, and for organization? There would be obvious advantages in such a course. When this movement was started a year ago, the idea was to unite, if possible, all the Synods of the Province in one great missionary enterprise, independent of, and as supplemental to, our ordinary Diocesan Missions; and which might ultimately expand into a Foreign Mission, worthy of our character and position, and analogous to the Foreign missions of the Church

at Home, or the Church in the United States. It seemed to the writer, at least, that there was danger of our becoming somewhat isolated and exclusive in our purely Diocesan work, and that the time was approaching, if indeed it had not already arrived, when we should prepare to take our part with other churches in the evangelization of purely heathen lands—as India, or China, or Africa.

The Canon proposed by the House of Bishops for the appointment of Missionary Bishops appeared admirably suited to facilitate this work. Why not secure its confirmation, and at once take advantage of its provisions? In Algoma we found a population, partly heathen and partly civilized, among whom a few missionaries had been laboring for forty years, and where for twenty years it had been thought advisable to create a Missionary Bishopric. The district belonged, it is true, to the Toronto diocese, the Bishop and Synod of which had so far exercised jurisdiction over it, and provided funds and service for it. But were not all our churches interested in the conversion of the Indians, and in the establishment of the Church in a new territory? Might not all be willing to contribute for the support of a Missionary Diocese based upon this principle, and having in view this object? Would it not be possible by a proper system of organization and effort to raise an endowment fund sufficiently large to meet all the requirements of the Mission? and as the fund became enlarged, and the claims upon it of the first Missionary See were reduced, by independent Diocesan contributions, could it not be made available for the commencement and support of another similar Bishopric, in some other equally necessitous part of the Dominion? May not the Provincial Synod, having elected a bishop, and defined the terms and bounds of his labors, appoint a General Missionary Committee or Board, composed of clerical and lay representatives from each diocese, with the bishops at its head, and with an efficient secretary to carry out its instructions, to co-operate with the Missionary Bishop in his arduous toil, to provide the means for carrying on the work, and to keep alive and burning with ever increasing brightness, the flame of missionary zeal throughout the Church? and could not the movement thus inaugurated expand, and consolidate, and attract, until its influence was felt in every part of the Dominion, until its seed became rooted in distant lands, and until our Canadian Church could claim honorable association with the mother and sister Churches of Great Britain and the United States, as a great Missionary Church?

Such indeed was the scheme which the writer at any rate had revolved, which was perhaps imperfectly sketched in the "Letter" on "Missionary Bishops," and in the "Address" on "The Algoma Mission," and which, with profound deference, I am still bold to maintain, is practicable in all its details, and demanded of us by the necessities of the Church and the times. If the Provincial Synod in December had acted upon this principle, and applied itself to the development of such an enterprise as this, I am persuaded the results would have been very different to-day from those we are called upon to contemplate. We should have witnessed an outburst of missionary enthusiasm which the Church in Canada has not yet experienced, and which would have supplied in a very short time an endowment fund adequate to all the demands; and we should have a diocese duly defined, and a bishop ready to enter upon his self-sacrificing work, rather than the miserable abortion which has struck sorrow into the hearts of a multitude of earnest Church-people, and which has done much to retard the missionary movement so happily begun.

In place of this, however, the Provincial Synod apparently took the most limited view of the subject upon which it was called to legislate, and made none, or but the most unsatisfactory arrangements for the future conduct of this great work. It informally set apart the Algoma District as a Missionary Diocese,—without, however, having first obtained, according to its own Canons, the concurrence of the Toronto diocese, to which the district primarily belonged;—but it neither determined the bounds of the diocese, nor indicated when or how the work of the diocese shall be begun and carried on. It elected a Missionary Bishop for Algoma; but it neither specified the salary he should receive nor made the smallest provision for the payment of the necessary expenses in working the Mission,—although its own Canon expressly stipulates, that “the House Bishops of shall be satisfied that adequate provision has been made for the support of a Missionary Bishop.”

These were blots in the legislation of the Provincial Synod. It seemed indeed, that that Synod was anxious only to launch this missionary ship; and having appointed a captain, was content to leave him without provisions for the voyage, or without a crew to man the vessel; and can we wonder that under such circumstances it foundered before it got out to sea? This furnishes a strong presumption against leaving the matter unconditionally at the disposal of the Provincial Synod. Another similar blunder may be made. It is doubtful whether the Metropolitan will summon another special meeting of the Provincial Synod. Should he not do this, the question must be deferred for at least another year; and even should he do this,—unless the Synod meets at once—the election cannot take place in time for the bishop to enter upon his work during the ensuing summer. There is yet nothing which borders upon the “adequate provision” for the support of a Missionary Bishop, which will satisfy the House of Bishops; and what is worse, there is not a single effort made or suggested towards raising that “provision.” The endowment was checked, after large promises had been made—some of which are now recalled. Without the consent of the respective Synods no guarantee can be given for an annual, or even for a special contribution. It is not likely that any Synod will object to guarantee an annual grant for so great an undertaking. But law and order require that each Synod should be requested thus to exercise its generosity, before a pledge is given on its behalf; and when once the application is made, we may rest assured that many an inquiry will be raised as to the proportions in which the amount required will be paid. It is still my most deliberate conviction, that by far the easiest and most effectual way of raising the money will be by endowment, and that we have committed a grave mistake in not pushing forward the movement we began for an endowment, to meet the generous offer of the Propagation Society. But if a guarantee is to be given at all by the Synods, it must be on somewhat equal terms. It is evident that at the Provincial Synod each Diocese will claim the right to vote for the election of the Bishop, and for the arrangements necessary in the organization of the See;—and properly so. The most casual observer, however, will see, that if we are to enter into this as a great united work, in which every diocese is interested, and for which every diocese is responsible, it must be by a principle of “equality”—as St. Paul puts it,—that one diocese may not be “eased” and another “burdened.” The principle of assessment for religious purposes, I hold, is radically bad. It always breeds mischief. Better at once throw the

scheme openly and fully upon the generosity of the Church, and abide by the result. Depend upon it, we shall not then be left short of funds. But if in this case an assessment is to be forced or preferred, then let it be made equitably. There is no reason, for example, why the Toronto diocese should be assessed to the extent of eight hundred, or a thousand dollars, whilst other dioceses in the Province equally able, comparatively speaking, should be put down at only two or three hundred dollars. The disproportion is too glaring, and is sure to provoke an amount of hostile criticism, which may endanger the whole scheme. Is there a probability that the whole Church will endorse the enterprise, and generously come forward in its support? Is it likely that another meeting of the Provincial Synod will be held in time to elect a Bishop, and to complete the organization of the scheme, for actual practical work during the ensuing summer? And may we hope that our party differences will be so far lulled or lost sight of, and that we may with so much unanimity and enthusiasm enter into the arrangement, as a burden from the Lord, as to prevent even the possibility of another failure like that which has already done great harm, and as will effectually secure, under the blessing of Heaven, a speedy and glorious success? If so,—if there be any assurance of these things, or even any rational ground on which to base an expectation of such a result,—then, by all means, let us leave the matter at the disposal of the Provincial Synod, and let us by anticipation accord to that Synod an evidence of hearty and general support. But if we cannot rely upon this,—if there is any danger of a repetition of the scenes which characterized the meeting of the last Provincial Synod, and of the vacillation, and dissatisfaction, and damage which have since ensued,—then, in the name of all that is sacred, and for the reputation of the Church we all hold to be so dear,—let some other plan be devised by which a satisfactory issue can be attained.

I do not think this would be impossible; and it is, indeed, questionable whether, under all the circumstances, the *third* alternative I have mentioned would not prove eventually the most feasible. The adoption of this plan would remit the whole thing to the Synod of the Toronto diocese, to be disposed of at its next session, as its united wisdom may suggest, and as its own Canons may permit. And there are, I must confess, apparently very strong reasons in favor of this course.

The Algoma District, it must be remembered, forms at the present time an essential and integral part of the Toronto diocese. It was included in the Letters Patent which were granted to the late Bishop of Toronto. In the extracts I have quoted, his Lordship makes mention of it as belonging to his diocese, and as, therefore, subject to his episcopal jurisdiction. With this assumption, the Bishop visited the district, and performed his episcopal functions there as a duty and a right. His successor in office has done precisely the same thing. The Synod of the Toronto diocese has legislated for Algoma, with the same conviction and assurance. It has voted money every year for sustaining the Church in the district; it has admitted to its deliberations, with the full power of speaking and voting, clerical and lay delegates from the district; it has received reports of the state and progress of the Church in the district; and it has been called upon to adjudicate upon differences which have sometimes unhappily arisen. These things undoubtedly constitute both a moral and legal possession; and if there be any part of the country which is to all intents and purposes included

within the limits of an "organized diocese—according to the spirit and phraseology of the first section of the Canon on Missionary Bishops, as enacted at the Provincial Synod in December—that district is Algoma.

The claim is thus clearly indisputable; and so the next point to be observed is, that this right of possession and jurisdiction has never yet been surrendered by the Toronto diocese. Without the concurrence of the Synod of that diocese, expressed by formal resolutions, the Algoma district cannot be separated from it, and formed into a Missionary See, either by the decision of the House of Bishops, or by the votes of the Provincial Synod. This will be apparent by reference to the two Canons of the Provincial Synod, which affect the question at issue, and by which we are bound in the matter. In the 9th Canon, it is provided that the House of Bishops shall have the power of subdividing existing dioceses, or of forming a new diocese out of portions of existing dioceses which may be contiguous, *with the concurrence or upon the application of the Synod or Synods of the diocese or dioceses affected; and it shall be the duty of such Synod or Synods to consider without delay any proposal for the subdivision of a diocese which may emanate from the House of Bishops.* The provisions of this Canon are certainly expressive and emphatic enough to remove all possibility of misapprehension as to the concurrent power of the Synod in any contemplated division of its diocese. But this even is made more certain by the 7th clause of the Canon on Missionary Bishops, and which passed both Houses of the Provincial Synod only after long discussion, and apparently as an amicable compromise. According to this clause "any diocese of the Province may, if it desires so to do, separate and set apart any portion of its territory as a district suitable for the establishment therein of a Missionary Bishopric; and such territory so set apart may become a Missionary Diocese and a Bishop be appointed thereto in accordance with the foregoing Canon." We cannot mistake this language; we cannot resist this decision. In each Canon there is an obvious and very proper attempt to guard the rights of the Diocesan Synods; and any infraction of those rights, or any violation of the Canon so emphatically worded, must be deplored as likely to result in an unpleasant collision between the Provincial Synod, with the House of Bishops at its head, and the Diocesan Synods, whose prerogatives have been set at naught.

The question, then, is forced upon us, whether the Toronto diocese and Synod have received the consideration which is their due, and for which the Canons provide, in the organization of Algoma as a Missionary Diocese? Has their "concurrence" been requested, according to the terms of the 9th Canon? or, has the Synod, of its own accord, formally "separated and set apart," by resolution, the Algoma District, "for the establishment therein of a Missionary Bishopric," as stipulated for in the 11th Canon? It does not appear to me that the Toronto Synod has done any such thing; and that, therefore, the action of the Provincial Synod in constituting Algoma a Diocese, and in electing a Bishop thereto, was, at least, premature. The subject has undoubtedly undergone discussion in the Toronto Diocese; and in the Synod, indeed, it has called forth at different times several important resolutions. But there is nothing which answers to the terms of the two Canons I have quoted, and which if we are to act legally, must form our basis and guide.

The principal, if not the only, resolutions of the Toronto Synod, bearing upon this subject, were passed at the sessions of 1868, 1871, and

1872. The first resolution, moved in 1868 by the Rev. Mr. Darling and seconded by Dr. Bovell, stated "that in view of the importance and extent of the field of Missionary labor among the Indians of the North West, and its isolation from the rest of the Diocese of Toronto, and in view also of the probable opening up for settlement of that territory," the Synod felt it was of the utmost importance that means should be devised for the appointment of a Missionary Bishop with as little delay as possible, and requested the Provincial Synod to give its most serious attention to the subject at its next session. In this resolution Algoma is not specifically mentioned, much less is it formally separated and set apart for any definitive action by the Provincial Synod.

There is the same indefiniteness and generality in the next resolution, moved by the Rev. T. S. Cartwright, and seconded by Dr. Lett, at the Synod of 1871. It refers to the large accession of territory, and the vast increase of population enjoyed by Canada consequent on Confederation, and the admission into the Dominion, of British Columbia, Manitoba, and other important districts; it recognizes the duty of the Church to supply every part of the Dominion with the appliances of education, and the ministrations of religion; it declares its opinion that the great mission work of the Church, especially in the Indian and newly formed settlements may be more effectively carried on under the direction of a General Mission Board appointed by the Provincial Synod, than by each separate Diocese in an isolated form; it, therefore, urges upon the Provincial Synod the importance of appointing Missionary Bishops, and electing a General Mission Board. In conformity with this resolution a memorial was prepared, and presented to the Provincial Synod; but in neither the resolution nor the memorial is there any formal and unconditional surrender of any portion of territory included in the diocese, much less of Algoma by name or in effect. At the Provincial Synod of 1871, the memorial was presented; no discussion took place upon it; and the utmost that was done was to refer it to a committee, which committee never had a meeting, and never made a report. So that even had the Toronto Synod offered the Algoma District to the Provincial Synod, the failure of that Synod to deal with the subject according to the terms proposed, nullified the offer, and justified any independent action the Toronto Diocese might take in the matter.

The subject was again taken up by the Synod of Toronto in 1872. It was first of all referred to by the Bishop in his opening address, as meeting his hearty approval; while towards the support of the proposed See of Algoma, his Lordship announced the offer of a grant of £950 from the Propagation Society. A resolution was afterwards submitted by the Rev. Mr. Givins, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Cartwright, declaring the immediate and imperative necessity of a Missionary Bishopric in Algoma, and appointing a Committee to confer on the subject with Committees appointed by the other Synods, that the best possible arrangement might be made, and the most united action secured. The Honorable Chief Justice Draper moved a resolution, seconded by the Venerable Archdeacon Palmer, acknowledging the generous grant of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and pledging the Toronto Diocese to raise its quota of the stipulated £4000. But in neither of these resolutions was the District of Algoma actually separated and set apart for a Missionary Bishopric, in conformity with the terms of the 11th Canon. The object obviously was, to promote inquiry, to prepare for action, to facilitate any practicable arrangement which might be possible. It never

occurred to the Synod that any attempt might be made to elect a Missionary Bishop, without first of all making "adequate provision" for his support, according to the requirements of the Canon; and certainly the promoters of the movement never for a moment supposed that a special meeting of the Provincial Synod would be so quickly summoned to decide the whole question, without waiting, or even asking for the report or the opinion of the Committees the Synods had appointed. Had there been such an anticipation, the Synod might have been more explicit and determinate in its resolution, especially in view of the scheme to be proposed by the Rev. Dr. Lett for a general division of the Diocese. And even as it is, had the arrangement of the Provincial Synod been consummated,—had the Bishopric been actually formed, and the Bishop elect have accepted the responsibilities of his office,—it is not too much to suppose that the Toronto Synod, with the concurrence of its Bishop, would have passed a retrospective resolution, confirming the arrangement, in so far as it was immediately and directly concerned, in order to remove the possibility of legal difficulty, and for the greater encouragement and support of the Bishop and his missionaries.

We cannot, however, be indifferent to the fact, that the subject is now presented in an entirely new shape. There is no Missionary Bishopric. The very first requisites for such a Bishopric are wanting. If the Provincial Synod were summoned to meet to-morrow for the purpose of electing a Bishop, its first duty would be to request the "concurrence" of the Diocese affected in the proposed division. Without this, it would simply violate its own laws; and any division or election, which might be made would not, and could not be binding. In putting the question in this form, I am not raising a quibble;—I am not stating a mere imaginary difficulty. My only aim is to interpret correctly the law, as that law has been enacted by the Provincial Synod, and to suggest the advisability under all circumstances of a rigid adherence to the law. The terms of the Canons are as explicit as they can well be made; and any invasion or infraction of them—except for the most special reason, under the most pressing emergency, to be covered by subsequent legislation,—can only result in disorder and mischief.

According to this interpretation, then, the Algoma District still forms an integral part of the Toronto Diocese. The clergymen of that Diocese are the missionaries there; the Mission fund of that Diocese is responsible for grants to carry on the missions there; the Bishop of that Diocese has announced his intention to make a Confirmation tour there during the approaching summer. All this implies the right of possession and control; and the Synod of the Toronto Diocese will very naturally and properly exercise a jealous regard over its own rights and power.

As a matter of course, this question must be discussed at the next session of that Synod. It is not possible to avoid it. Whether it come up in the shape of a request from the House of Bishops for a division, according to the 9th Canon; or in the form of a resolution from some of its own members for a separation, according to the 11th Canon; or through an application for an annual grant in support of a Missionary Bishopric in Algoma, according to an informal proposal of the Bishops, or any other authority, it must be introduced, and it will have to undergo discussion. Any attempt to prevent this will fail. We may as well try to check the swelling tide, or to lay an embargo on human thought, as forestall a free expression of opinion upon a matter which is attended with grave complication, and which the action of others, outside the Toronto Synod, has forced upon it.

And when the subject is thus introduced, what course should be pursued? what decision should be arrived at? It is easier to ask than to answer this question; and in all I write, I am wishful rather to suggest inquiry than to dictate action. It will be unfortunate for the Church if the majority of the Synod should go there unfamiliar with the question at issue, and unprepared to record upon it an intelligent vote. A constitutional principle is involved; the progress of the Church is very much at stake. There is no doubt that a wise decision will be formed; and the probability of this will be all the greater if, in the meantime, we candidly consider all the bearings of the subject. As it appears to me, there are two courses open before the Toronto Synod, one of which it must adopt. It may either act in accordance with the 7th clause of the Canon on Missionary Bishops, and by its own act separate and set apart the Algoma District as "suitable for the establishment therein of a Missionary Bishopric;" and then memorialize the Provincial Synod to proceed forthwith to the election of a Missionary Bishop for such diocese, conformally with its own Canon; or, it may retain possession of the district, and for the more effective performance of missionary work therein, separate it from the other parts of the Diocese, and elect a Suffragan or Missionary Bishop, according to its own Canons and By-Laws. The distinction between the two plans of action thus submitted is this, that the first remits the matter entirely to the Provincial Synod, and henceforward the Toronto Diocese will have no direct interest and responsibility in the Missionary Bishopric of Algoma; whereas the second preserves in the Toronto Synod the power of independent action, and will impose upon it the burden of providing an "adequate support."

It is almost difficult, at first sight, to say which would be the preferable plan. If, as I have already shown, we can only be assured of united and hearty co-operation throughout all the Churches comprised within our Ecclesiastical Province, then there can be no question that the first proposal will be the most acceptable, and that without any hesitation we should confide the subject to the Provincial Synod. But there seem to be serious doubts about the propriety of such an arrangement. The experience of the last two sessions of the Provincial Synod is not very reassuring. There is danger of delay; there is danger of disunion; there is danger of another break down; and while fully alive to the magnitude of the work, and to the difficulty of its accomplishment, I am inclined, with others, to the opinion, that the least of two evils will be, for the Synod of the Toronto Diocese to form an independent Missionary Diocese, to elect the Bishop according to its own Canons, to provide the necessary funds by endowment and grant, and to make the regulations by which the work shall be carried on.

The Synod has an unquestionable right and power to do this. It may by its own vote separate any portion of its territory from the rest, and form it into an exclusive Missionary See, or independent Diocese, as has been done in the Diocese of Rupert's Land, and as Dr. Lett has proposed in his scheme for a threefold division; or the Bishop even may request the appointment of a Suffragan for any particular portion of his diocese, with or without the right of succession to the office and title of Bishop of Toronto, on the demise of the present occupant of the See. In either case the Synod would proceed to an election according to the rules which have been already provided, and which may at the time be laid down. The election could take place at the annual meeting of the Synod, or at a special session convened for that purpose. Both

the clerical and lay delegates from the District which is thus to be placed under especial episcopal supervision, would have a voice and vote in electing the man who should have authority over them in the Lord; and both for expedition, and convenience, and efficiency, it would really seem that this may be the easiest solution of our difficulty, and the course most likely to result in the immediate extension and permanent establishment of the Church.

In proposing such an arrangement, it would be well also to consider whether the limits of this Missionary Diocese might not be advantageously extended, and whether it could not prove conducive to all the interests involved if Muskoka were added to Algoma. At present, Muskoka belongs to the Diocese of Toronto, equally with Algoma; whilst its need of missionary exertion is no less urgent and binding. As a new district of country, it is rapidly opening up; and whether or not, it is destined to realize the flattering promises of the Government in inaugurating its Free Land Grant policy, or the still more sanguine hopes excited by emigration agents, Muskoka is undoubtedly an immense district, with a growing population, and with increasing facilities for trade, and for missions. It covers an area of 3,396,887 acres of land, a large portion of which is valuable for its mineral resources, and is highly favorable for agricultural pursuits. In 1861, there was the small population of 320, whereas this had increased in 1871, according to the Census Returns, to 6,919. The religious element is fairly represented; and our own Church notably among the different denominations. There are Roman Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, and other religious bodies, returning in the whole little more than 4000 members, whilst the membership of the Church of England alone amounts to over 2000. Here is the beginning of a great work; here is the nucleus of a most successful Mission. Why, then, may not the two Missions of Algoma and Muskoka be joined together as one Bishopric, supported from one fund, and subject to one control? The distance between the two districts is not insurmountable, while the advantage of direct episcopal supervision would be great. It is not an arrangement which should be made permanent, as each district is sufficiently large to form an independent See, and in due time two bishops must occupy the territory between them. But as preliminary to this, the proposal I have made is not without its points of recommendation; and whether the arrangement be left with the Toronto, or to the Provincial Synod, I respectfully submit that the union I have suggested is not unworthy of consideration.

I am compelled to touch again on the question of money. Our principal difficulty lies there; and yet I cannot for the life of me see that there need be any difficulty at all. It will undoubtedly require a large amount of money to begin, and to carry on this enterprise efficiently; and it is undeniably certain that the whole, or, at any rate, a large proportion of the required sum might have been raised by this time, if we had gone about the thing in the right way. The question of endowment has been too lightly thought of all the way through. Is it not incomprehensible that not a single word was said about this matter at the Provincial Synod? and is it not lamentable to think that the whole year has been allowed to pass away without a fund having been started? Fancy a Synod electing a Missionary Bishop without the "provision" of *a single cent* much less "an adequate provision"—for carrying on his work. And fancy the whole Church burning with zeal on this subject,

willing to contribute, and waiting to be solicited; and yet no official appeal being made, and a voluntary effort being discouraged! This has been, and this is our position at the present moment. If a subscription had been commenced at each Synod, especially after the passing of the resolution declaring the necessity of a Missionary Bishopric, and after the announcement of the generous offer made by the Propagation Society; or if the Committees appointed by the Synods had been convened together to organize a plan for a general subscription, and the arrangement had been vigorously carried out, as it was intended, I am confident that both rich and poor, that both young and old alike, would have joined in the contribution, and that the result would, even by this time, have surpassed our highest expectations. There were cases in which to my own knowledge sums varying from FIVE HUNDRED to one hundred, to fifty, to twenty, to ten, and even to five dollars were offered, unsolicited, if the work were earnestly begun. For some extraordinary reason, the movement tending towards an endowment was suspended; many of the foregoing promises were withdrawn, because there was evidently no hearty cooperation and no properly organized system; and positively we find ourselves to-day in no better condition,—with no more funds, with no surer plan, and with no brighter prospects,—than we had twelve months ago. On every ground this is to be deplored; and by whomsoever the future arrangements may be made, the first imperative duty now is, to utilize the short space left us before the meeting of the Synods in June to *commence* the necessary endowment.

An Endowment, I still maintain, is an absolute necessity. The work cannot be carried on effectively without it. It may be wise for each Synod to pledge itself to contribute an annual grant towards the support of the Mission, so long as it may be needed; but if the amount required can be secured without that, it will be better for both the Synods and the Mission. The £950 so kindly offered by the Propagation Society, were made contingent on the raising of £4000 in Canada, to be invested as a permanent endowment; and if we refuse the condition, do we not virtually decline the offer to which it was annexed? It has seemed to me that really the common impression was that all we had to do was to raise a salary for the Bishop, amounting to about \$2000, and that this could be more conveniently done by assessment upon the Synods, than by an appeal for voluntary offerings throughout the Church. I must be pardoned for pronouncing this a grand delusion—a fatal mistake. As I have shown in some of my former letters, the salary of the Bishop forms only one item, and that by no means the most important item, in the general expense. There are the salaries of the missionaries to be provided for; and there are the funds to be supplied for building churches and schools, and for procuring Bibles, and Prayer Books, and Hymn Books, and Catechisms, and for keeping in active and efficient operation all the working machinery of the Mission. It cannot be expected that the Bishop can provide these out of his \$2000 per year. It is not to be supposed that at first, at least, the Churches in the Diocese will be able without extraneous aid to meet all the demands which may thus be made, and which must be responded to by somebody. It surely is not intended that the Bishop shall desert his diocese, and neglect his proper work of organizing and teaching, that he might visit England, or even the different parts of Canada, as a sort of episcopal beggar, to raise funds for himself and his missionaries. All this should be done for him by the

responsible committee, that his mind might be unembarrassed, and that he might be free to fulfil his apostolic commission in the spirit of his Master, and of the first great Missionary Bishops of the Church. O, it will never do to attempt an establishment of this Missionary Bishopric upon terms which must inevitably result in depression and failure. It is supremely desirable to enforce that part of the Canon which requires that "adequate provision" shall be made before a Missionary Bishop can be appointed. At present, there is no such "adequate provision;" there is in fact no provision at all! It would be a mockery to talk of another election upon such terms; it would be trifling with any clergyman to ask him to undertake the responsibilities, and to submit to the sacrifices inseparable from the office of a Missionary Bishop, with such a slender and visionary guarantee of support. No such folly is perpetrated in the missionary movements of the Church at Home, or of the Church in the United States, or indeed of any Missionary Society in existence; and surely we shall not so far stultify ourselves, and frustrate our own great design, as to neglect the very first elements of business prudence and religious order.

The question may, indeed, be asked, what in this case do we mean by "an adequate provision"? and really it is not a difficult question to answer. There is no desire that our Bishop should receive a "princely income," and live in a gorgeous palace, and be "clothed in fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day"; and that his missionaries should be made gentlemen of independent means, if not of landed estates, with less work, and larger incomes, than the majority of the hard working clergy of our present parishes and missions. Nothing so preposterous has ever entered the heads of any of the promoters of this scheme; and nothing so impracticable would ever be entertained by any bishop or missionary. We have not yet outlived the days of apostolic simplicity and zeal; and if I am not very much mistaken there are men amongst us in Canada who are not unwilling to follow the example of the devoted young Selwyn, and his equally devoted companion and friend, Still, in England, and give up houses, and lands, and friends, and home, for the sake of Christ, and at the call of His Church.

But we are not insensible to the fact that the wants of nature must be supplied, in even the most devoted and zealous; and that in carrying on successfully missionary work, in a new country and among a poor population—many of whom are Indians and heathen,—large resources will be inevitably needed. It is not simply the expense of living that we have to take into account; we must look at the expense of travelling in so wide a district, often by special conveyance and with selected guides; we must think of the gratuities which have to be given as a passport to Indian confidence and sympathy, and of the relief which has to be afforded in food, in clothes, and in homes; and we must duly estimate the working expenses of such a mission in salaries, in buildings, and in books, &c. When we have done this, the conviction will be pretty firmly settled in our minds, that "an adequate provision" means something more than \$2000 for the payment of a Bishop's salary; and that little less than \$10,000 will suffice for doing the work as it should be done, with honor to the Church, and with advantage to the District in which the Bishopric is established.

I have before stated my own impression, that at least \$100,000 should be raised as an endowment. It was thought by some that my figures were extravagant, and that I had proposed an amount that was unattain-

able. These figures have been open to correction; I have even struck off half the sum, in deference to those whose fears have controlled their judgments. Yet I am bound to declare, that with all the additional information I have received, I do not think that my first estimate was unreasonable, or one single dollar above the mark. We cannot presume upon giving the Bishop a less salary than \$3,000, to include his travelling, and other official expenses. A salary of \$800 per year will be found limited enough for a missionary, with a wife, and possibly young children; and if only 10 such were employed, there would be an annual claim of \$8,000. Is it likely that the working apparatus of the Mission—the building of churches and schools, etc.—will be less, for the first few years, than \$4,000 per year? Here, then, apart from all other things, we have a total sum of \$15,000, which must be annually raised and paid, if this great project is to succeed as we wish it, and as it should and might do. The interest of \$100,000, at 6 per cent, supposing the money to be invested in Dominion Stock, or in County Debentures, would yield us only \$6000. Where then is the balance of \$9000 to come from? It must be provided; and how? May not the Missions in the Diocese itself contribute at the rate of \$4000 per year? May not our present Synods guarantee an annual collection in each parish throughout the Province, and which, without assessing any Synod with any particular amount, may yield on an average, say \$3000? And is not likely that the voluntary contributions of friends at a distance—in England and other places, who may be interested in our work, as reported in our *Missionary Chronicle or Record*—will amount to another \$1000 or \$2000 per year? The entire amount supposed to be necessary would thus be forthcoming; and free from all encumbrance and embarrassment, about the ways and means for supporting themselves, and for prosecuting their work, both the Bishop and his missionaries would have time and courage to labor, in season and out of season, for the education and christianization of the people committed to their care.

Now can any lower estimate be formed, with a due regard to the efficiency of the Mission? It is possible that other minds may conceive a different plan of action, and present a more economical table of costs. If it can be done, we should, by all means, have the advantage of such light. There is nothing lost by candid and full discussion. It is indeed by the contact of mind with mind that truth is eliminated, and that difficulties are overcome. I should be rejoiced to see the way open for a less demand upon the Church than I have supposed necessary. But at present I cannot imagine how it is to be done,—on the basis, at least, on which my reasoning and assumptions rest. The cry of economy may easily be raised; and no doubt numbers of self-indulgent christians, who know nothing of sacrifice and toil for the Church, will be ready enough to propose lower stipends for the bishop and his missionaries, and a smaller expenditure in the general working of the mission. We must, however, consider efficiency rather than economy; and we must provide for actual wants, for certain demands, rather than wait for contingencies to arise, and then meet them by any shifting policy which may seem adapted to the emergency, and which, in the long run,—like the system of accommodation bills at a bank,—will be both more troublesome and expensive. If I understand the movement aright, our object is to establish a Mission which will reflect credit upon the Church, and confer lasting benefit upon the district within which its influence will be diffused. On any other principle the

whole thing would be a huge revolting sham. We had better not move another step,—better not desire even a resuscitation of the all but dead and buried enterprise,—than call into existence a miserable deformity, which can only excite pity, and which can never perform the functions of life. This must be the case, if we still go upon the plan apparently adopted at the Provincial Synod. But if, on the other hand, we are to have a healthy, vigorous, and successful Mission, which it will be a pride to contemplate, and which shall soon be made a praise in the whole earth, we must lay down broad principles, and we must aspire to great things; and whether I am right or wrong, I must still avow a most profound and deliberate conviction that we cannot, and ought not to attempt to do this, without an income of FROM FIFTEEN TO TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS A YEAR. To those who think differently, I can only say at present—"Show cause; produce your estimates; give us your facts and figures; and we can then reason and judge."

But is it possible, with all the other demands which are pressing upon the Church, to raise at once such an immense sum as \$100,000? Most assuredly, in my judgment, it is; and that without any very great difficulty either. The precise method by which the money should be raised, must be determined by the Committee already in existence, or by any other Committee which may hereafter be appointed. But that the whole amount may be raised by a proper organization, and by an ordinary amount of business energy and christian zeal, I can no more doubt than I can despair of the ultimate establishment of the Church throughout this vast Continent. It is doubtless a special work, and must be so taken up by every member of the Church. We shall commit a grievous mistake if we place it upon a level with the common, every day movements in which our parishes and the public are asked to unite. There is a distinctness and a speciality about it, which mark it out as deserving more than ordinary consideration and support; and there is no reason why appeals on behalf of this, and why contributions in favor of this, should not be made independently of every other object which may claim our sympathy and co-operation. It is, indeed, partly in its special character that its importance lies. In the Church, as in the State, occasions sometimes arise in which an unusual effort must be made, in which an extraordinary manifestation of generosity and energy is required, in order that great principles may be maintained, or that sublime results may be achieved, and that thus the Church may advance with the country and the age, and retain, if not increase its power, as the witness and defender of the truth, and as the teacher and evangelizer of mankind. And all such special enterprises must be begun, all such extraordinary work must be carried on, without the suspension of any ordinary effort, or the withdrawal of any single contribution which may be necessary for supporting the existing institutions of the Church. This is precisely the position in which the Algoma Mission does, or should stand. It is a new enterprise, to meet the wants of a new country; it is intended to open up before the Church a new era of missionary zeal, and to bring back upon the Church in its reflex influences new and richer blessings than have heretofore been enjoyed; it demands for its success the union of all our heads, the energy of all our hands, the generosity of all our hearts; and in thus coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and offering of our own free will, of all the substance that God has given us, we are to neglect no other duty, withhold no other effort. This must be distinct, common, over and above, all

else that we have given and done; and in this its value and acceptability will in part consist:

On this principle, I can conceive no insurmountable difficulty, and I can see no intolerable burden, in raising within twelve months an endowment for Algoma of ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS. If the work be left solely to the Toronto Synod, it will become so much more onerous for that body. In that case the other Synods may withhold their active cooperation, and the area over which an appeal can be made will be proportionately limited. It may, however, be assumed that with this arrangement the entire burden of responsibility will not be left upon the Toronto Diocese. Surely the other dioceses will extend a helping hand; each bishop would no doubt permit an application to be made in his diocese; and is there a single clergyman who would refuse to make an appeal from his pulpit, and to become the medium through which the contributions of his flock may be forwarded to the managing Committee? But should the arrangement originally proposed be carried out—which is most likely,—and the responsibility and duty be left to the Provincial Synod, then all question of difficulty must vanish, and as the whole Church will be accessible to the appeal, so every individual member may be expected to contribute.

It needs but a very simple process to raise the whole amount. May it not be done by PERSONAL SUBSCRIPTIONS; by a SPECIAL OFFERTORY in each Church; and by the use, for a given time, of COLLECTING BOXES and CARDS in each Sunday School? We start with, say \$5,000, as a grant from the Propagation Society. Another gift from England has been made, to the amount of £500, towards the erection of a Bishop's house. It is certain that by proper application being made, other Societies in England will follow the example of the Propagation Society, and that other private persons may emulate the zeal of the anonymous donor of the £500; and that thus, the \$5,000 may soon be augmented into \$20,000. Will any body pretend that the whole of our Church population in Canada is unable or unwilling to raise the balance required, whatever may be the amount? In the five dioceses forming our Ecclesiastical Province, in Ontario and Quebec, there are, according to the Census returns of 1871, say in round numbers, 400,000 members of the Church of England. How many names of Sunday School children we have on our roll, I am not able to ascertain accurately; but at a very low estimate we may count upon say, 500,000. If, then, an average contribution were made of 25 cents per member, we should have at one stroke \$100,000; and if again an average subscription were given of 5 cents per scholar, there would be an addition of \$25,000; or, reducing it to 2 cents per scholar, it would furnish \$10,000. And are we to be told that such a scheme is impracticable—that such sums are unattainable? I cannot myself believe it; on the contrary, I believe that this, and more than this, can be realized within a year, if we enter upon the work with an earnest spirit, and a determined will. Are there not a few amongst us who would give each their \$500? Are there not others who would give their \$200, or \$300, or \$400? more still who would give their \$100, or \$50, or \$20, or \$10, or \$5? and more again who would pay their \$1, or 50 or 25 cents? And thereby, at a very moderate calculation, might we not count upon \$80,000, or \$90,000? In each Sunday School a few Collecting Boxes, or Mite Chests could be distributed; whilst it is certain that many families would gladly avail themselves of them. At least 5000 of these might be employed; and supposing their receipts,

when opened, averaged only from \$1 to \$2—which according to my own experience, and to the evidence of the Mission Board in the United States, is a very low estimate indeed,—we should have a clear income alone of nearly \$10,000. In this way more than \$100,000 would be raised; and in a monetary point of view, the Mission would be placed upon a firm and sure basis.

There is nothing visionary in such calculations; there is nothing improbable in such results. A feeling of indifference, or a spirit of unbelief, may suggest difficulties, and affect a sneer; and as we have often seen in the history of great enterprises, both commercial and religious, the true principle and the right plan may have to work their way through prejudice and opposition, until their unquestioned practicability and success claim and receive universal homage. I do not doubt for a moment that by the application of right means, and with the hearty cooperation of those who are interested in the scheme, all I have foreshadowed may be attained; and if we do not attempt something of this sort, then I am persuaded we shall miss a glorious opportunity for demonstrating the generosity and energy of the Church, and shall retard for years a work which is demanded at once, and which more than anything else will extend the influence and enhance the reputation of the Church.

But how is it to be done? There is after all, a great distinction between assertion and proof; we want something tangible and real in preference to that which is only conjectural or visionary. I am not afraid to explain the method by which I think the whole thing may be accomplished. If other minds can suggest a more simple and effective plan, so much the better for the cause we have in hand. In my judgment, we should go back to one of the first points I have mentioned, and summon a meeting of the General Committee appointed by the Synods. We could then act without authority, and in a perfectly constitutional manner. By that Committee a report should be prepared for the Synods, and an appeal issued to the Church. Under the instructions of the Committee, and with the special sanction of each Bishop, the Secretary should place himself in communication with every Diocesan Committee, and with every clergyman in every parish. On one given Sunday, the subject should be explained and enforced in every Church and School throughout the Province, when a special offertory should be made, and when voluntary subscriptions should be solicited. In connection with this, promissory notes may be distributed to those who choose to avail themselves of them; and envelopes marked "Algoma Mission" should be circulated widely, so that persons at any time they wish may enclose a contribution, whether large or small, whether with or without a name, at the ordinary service and offertory of the parish to which they belong. The Collecting Boxes, all properly numbered and registered, should be distributed at the same time to those who desire them, and who will use, and return them within a specified time. In some cases, special personal applications may be made for subscriptions; in some parishes meetings may be held, or sermons may be preached, by the Secretary or other suitable deputations; and in all cases ample information should be furnished, and a regular monthly statement should be presented, of the progress of the work, and of the amounts obtained, that the interest may be kept alive, and that public generosity may be enlarged.

This is not a complicated arrangement; it is simplicity itself. In its

practical development it will impose hard work upon some one, and it will require a united purpose and an energetic will on the part of all who are interested in its success? And are not these the ordinary conditions of success in every great enterprise, whether commercial or political, or religious? Have we ever known a business prosper without close application? Have we ever known a political party triumphant without determined courage? Have we ever known a Church organization succeed without energy and faith? What would have been the state of the world, or what the present aspects of the Church, if our ancestors had been startled at difficulties? or if they had been timid in resolution, and wavering in purpose, and apathetic in action? How do the great Missionary Societies in England and America raise their enormous funds for circling the globe with religious truth? Is it not by united counsel, by persevering effort, by general contribution? Have they not distinct Committees, special sermons, public meetings, hosts of collectors, with both books and boxes? Do they not widely diffuse information? Do they not incessantly stir up the missionary spirit? Do they not appeal for the princely offerings of the rich? Do they not record the humble sacrifices of the poor? And are we above such methods,—independent of such means? Is it derogatory to our character to follow the example of those who are wiser if not more zealous than we are? and can point with exultation to their Mission fund and field as affording proof of the practicability of their plans, and of the approving blessing of Heaven? Or, is it to go forth to the Church and the world, that we are too disunited, and too apathetic, and too feeble, to effect any such organization, and to make any such successful effort, and that we must brand ourselves with the stigma of those who can talk much, and yet do little?

There is a nobler destiny before us than this. With all our apparent divisions, the heart of the Church is radically sound. In our different ways we all sincerely desire that the Church may manfully perform its work in the world, and that in doing this it may become a praise and blessing. If we can but unite our sympathies and forces on one great object, we shall prove ourselves to be giants in strength, and we shall attain a brilliant success. No more encouraging opportunity was ever presented; no more important demand was ever made, no more cheering prospects was ever unfolded than those in connection with this Algoma and Muskoka Mission. We shall be recreant to our principles,—we shall be faithless to our duty, if we do not respond heartily to the call; and as one man, come to the help of the Lord against the mighty. The times are propitious; the difficulties are small; the harvest will be great. Are we unthankful for our mercies? Are we insensible to our obligation? Are we indifferent to our destiny? Do we care nothing for the claims of Heaven? Do we despise the necessities of earth? Do we spurn the sacrifices of our forefathers? Do we shun the example of our Saviour and his apostles? O, no such revolting crime shall stain our souls; no such unholy deeds shall deform our lives. We are not unmindful of the responsibility which rests upon us; we are unworthy of the men who have gone before us; we are not unequal to the work which is demanded of us. There is wealth, there is talent, there is faith, there is devotion, there is zeal, there is courage, in our midst, which may render us impregnable to any foe, and which may place within our grasp the most transcendent results. It is now that the "set time" has come for the development of our

resources, and for the inauguration of a new enterprise, which shall leave its impress upon our history and upon the world; and when by voices within, and by appeals from without,—when by the workings of the Spirit, and by the openings of Providence,—when by the command of God, and by the entreaty of precious souls,—when by the inspiring example of the Church in other lands, and by the mysterious and overwhelming sacrifice of Christ,—we are summoned to immediate action, impelled onward in the path of duty,—O, is there one amongst us who does not feel the enkindling flame of love divine, and who is not ready to make some sacrifice, to give some money, to perform some service, by which the Church may be honoured in its missionary career, and by which the Redeemer may see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied?

With this view, I have written this appeal. It is but an imperfect contribution to a glorious cause. If I have dropped any unguarded word, or revealed any improper spirit, I must ask to be forgiven; and in this, as in all other movements, I am sure we shall every one pray that God who did teach the hearts of His faithful people by sending to them the light of His Holy Spirit, would “grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and ever more to rejoice in His holy comfort, through the merits of Christ Jesus our Saviour.”

“JULIUS ANGLICANUS.”

 Copies of this Letter may be delivered on application at the Publishers, Messrs. Lawson, McCulloch, Hamilton. Five cents per copy.